UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CHRISTINE GREEN

7915 Pickering St.

Philadelphia, PA 19150

CIVIL ACTION

CASE NO.:

Plaintiff,

v,

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

CONGREGATION OF THE MISSION OF: ST. VINCENT DE PAUL IN: GERMANTOWN, D/B/A ST. VINCENT'S: SEMINARY: 500 East Chelten Ave. Philadelphia, PA 19144:

Defendant

CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, Christine Green (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff" unless indicated otherwise), hereby complains as follows against Congregation of the Mission of St. Vincent De Paul in Germantown, D/B/A St. Vincent's Seminary (hereinafter referred to as "Defendant"), and avers as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff initiates the instant action to redress violations by Defendant of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA" - 29 U.S.C. §§ 621 et. seq.), 42 U.S.C. Section 1981 ("Section 1981"), Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII" - 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000d et. seq.), the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act ("PHRA")¹ and the Philadelphia Fair Practices

¹ Plaintiff will move to amend the instant Complaint to include violations of the PHRA after full administrative exhaustion before the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission. Such claims will identically mirror Plaintiff's federal claims asserted herein under the Title VII, Section 1981 and the ADEA.

Ordinance², and the Pennsylvania Wage Payment Collection Law ("WPCL") (43 P.S. 260.3(a)-(b)). As a direct consequence of Defendant's unlawful actions, Plaintiff seeks damages as set forth herein.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. This Court, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1331, has jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims, because this civil action arises under a law of the United States.
- 3. This Court may properly maintain personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant's contacts with this state and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction over Defendant to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the United States Supreme Court in *International Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310 (1945) and its progeny. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state-law claim(s) because such claim(s) arise out of the same common nucleus of operative facts as his federal claims asserted herein.
- 4. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and (b)(2), venue is properly laid in this district because all of the acts and/or omissions giving rise to the claims set forth herein occurred in this judicial district and Defendant is deemed to reside where they are subject to personal jurisdiction, rendering Defendant a citizen of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.
- 5. Plaintiff filed a Charge of discrimination and retaliation with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") and also dual-filed said charge with the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission ("PHRC").

² Plaintiff will move to amend his instant lawsuit to include a claim under the Philadelphia Fair Practices Ordinance once her administrative remedies are fully exhausted with the Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations. Any claims under the Philadelphia Fair Practices Ordinance would mirror the Section 1981, Title VII and ADEA claims identically.

6. Plaintiff is proceeding herein under the Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 1981, and the ADEA, and has properly exhausted her administrative remedies by timely filing a Charge of Discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") and by filing the instant lawsuit within ninety (90) days of receiving a notice of dismissal and/or right to sue letter from the EEOC.

PARTIES

- 7. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
 - 8. Plaintiff is an adult individual, with an address as set forth in the caption.
- 9. Defendant Congregation of the Mission of St. Vincent De Paul in Germantown, D/B/A St. Vincent's Seminary (hereinafter referred to as "Defendant") is a private, non-profit organization providing religious services to clients, located at the above-captioned address.
- 10. At all times relevant herein, Defendant acted by and through its agents, servants and employees, each of whom acted at all times relevant herein in the course and scope of their employment with and for Defendant.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 11. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
 - 12. Plaintiff is an African-American (black), sixty-seven (67) year-old female.
- 13. Plaintiff was employed with Defendant for approximately thee (3) years as a Certified Nursing Assistant.
- 14. While employed with Defendant, Plaintiff was a dedicated and hard-working employee who performed her job well.

- 15. During Plaintiff's last approximately three months of employment, Plaintiff was indirectly supervised by Ed Hearns (hereinafter "Mr. Hearns") who was the interim Director of Nursing Service.
- 16. During Plaintiff approximately last three months of employment she was directly supervised by Stephanie Chesney (hereinafter "Ms. Chesney") whom was hired full-time as a Charge Nurse.
 - 17. Ms. Chesney is a Caucasian, female.
- 18. Once Plaintiff began to be supervised by Ms. Chesney, Plaintiff was subjected to discriminatory treatment by Ms. Chesney due to her race and age.
- 19. For example, unlike Plaintiff's younger and non-black employees, Ms. Chesney treated Plaintiff in a rude and condescending manner, spoke to her abruptly, and made up false accusations that Plaintiff, and was not properly completing their job assignments.
- 20. Ms. Chesney would have social conversations and be cordial to Plaintiff's, white, younger co-workers, but would not have the same conversations or interactions with Plaintiff or her African-American co-workers.
- 21. Ms. Chesney would intentionally fail to inform Plaintiff of certain patient issues from the previous shift, even though she was required to under the policy. This led to Plaintiff being required to unnecessary and duplicative work.
- 22. Although Plaintiff was aware of her job duties, Ms. Chesney would constantly approach Plaintiff and ask her if she had completed certain tasks. Ms. Chesney knew these tasks were not yet completed, as they were generally scheduled later in Plaintiff's shift, nonetheless, Ms. Chesney would harass Plaintiff about these future tasks. Each time Plaintiff was following proper

procedure, but it seemed as if Ms. Chesney simply wanted to harass the Plaintiff. Ms. Chesney would not do this to the white, younger employees.

- 23. Furthermore, Ms. Chesney would assign the African-American employees tasks that the Caucasian employees were not required to complete.
- 24. Additionally, on one occasion when Ms. Chesney was harassing Plaintiff about the tasks she had to complete in the future, Ms. Chesney out of the blue stated "you look young for your age but you still have to complete all your tasks." Plaintiff aware of her responsibilities and always completed her required tasks, so this comment seemed like Ms. Chesney was treating Plaintiff different due to her age.
- 25. Ms. Chesney falsely accused Plaintiff and another African-American (male) employee of receiving multiple complaints from patients. Ms. Chesney wrote up a document outlining these alleged complaints.
- 26. Plaintiff met with Mr. Hearns and Ms. Chesney about the complaints, and when Ms. Chesney could not explain who made such complaints it was determined they were unfounded. As such, Plaintiff was informed by Mr. Hearns that the document would be destroyed, since it was false.
- 27. Due to this treatment, during the last approximate month of her employment with Defendant, Plaintiff complained several times to Mr. Hearns that she was being subjected to discrimination and harassment by Ms. Chesney and she believed it was due to her race and age. Plaintiff requested that this conduct cease.
- 28. Mr. Hearns acknowledged Plaintiff's complaints of age and racial discrimination and told Plaintiff that Ms. Chesney would be spoken and/or disciplined for such behavior.

However, following these complaints Plaintiff continued to be subjected to discriminatory and retaliatory treatment.

- 29. After Plaintiff complained (about race and age discrimination) to Mr. Hearns on multiple occasions, Mr. Hearns began to ignore Plaintiff and inform her that he no longer wanted to hear of any complaints.
- 30. After Plaintiff complained of race and age discrimination, Ms. Chesney began to follow Plaintiff around and nitpick her work performance. For example, when Plaintiff would finish caring for a patient, Ms. Chesney would immediately check what Plaintiff did and would try to find fault in her work performance. Ms. Chesney did not follow around and/or nitpick Plaintiff's white and younger co-workers who had not complained.
- 31. When nothing was done to address her complaints of race/age discrimination, Plaintiff then complained to Father Greg, who was superior to both Mr. Hearns and Ms. Chesney.
- 32. Father Greg informed Plaintiff that another black employee had also complained about Ms. Chesney and that he wanted to set up a meeting between Plaintiff, the other black employee, Mr. Hearns and Ms. Chesney.
- 33. Approximately a week later the black male employee was terminated by the Defendant.
- 34. Within a couple weeks, on January 23, 2018, Plaintiff was also terminated from Defendant.
- 35. Therefore, Plaintiff was never provided with a meaningful meeting to discuss her complaints of race/age discrimination.
- 36. Plaintiff had complained about race and age discrimination at least two (2) to three (3) times in the month leading up to her termination.

- 37. When Plaintiff was terminated, she was told that she was being terminated due to her unsatisfactory work performance.
- 38. However, throughout her three (3) years of employment, Plaintiff's performance was satisfactory and she had never received any discipline. Therefore, her termination was completely pretextual.
- 39. Defendants failed to follow their progressive disciplinary policy, as they terminated Plaintiff without issuing her any discipline.
- 40. Upon information and belief Plaintiff was replaced by an individual that was approximately twenty (20) years younger than the Plaintiff.
- 41. Plaintiff's termination was completely pretextual as 1) it followed shortly after her complaints of discrimination: 2) her younger non-black co-workers were treated more favorably; 3) she received antagonism following her complaints of discrimination; 4) she was terminated for false reasons and 5) Defendant failed to issue any discipline to Plaintiff prior to her termination.
- 42. Furthermore, Plaintiff was informed that she would be paid for any vacation that was unused, but at the end of her employment she was not paid any unused vacation time.

Count I <u>Violations of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA")</u> ([1] Age Discrimination & [2] Retaliation)

- 43. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 44. Prior to Plaintiff's termination, Plaintiff complained to Defendant's management that she was being discriminated against and harassed because of her age and that she wanted the same to cease.

- 45. Plaintiff believes and avers herein that her age and/or her complaints about Defendant's unlawful age discrimination practices was a determinative factor in her termination.
 - 46. These actions as aforesaid constitute violations of the ADEA.

Count II <u>Violations of 42 U.S.C. Section 1981</u> ([1] Race Discrimination & [2] Retaliation)

- 47. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 48. During her period of employment, Plaintiff observed that Ms. Chesney exhibited favoritism towards the non-black employees within his group in comparison to Plaintiff, including but not limited to Defendant's types of questions, frequency of questions, and tone of questions.
- 49. Plaintiff also observed that Ms. Chesney exhibited a hostile and antagonistic demeanor towards Plaintiff that she did not exhibit towards the non-black employees within her group under Mr. Hearn's direct supervision.
- 50. Plaintiff believes and avers herein that his race and/or his complaints about Defendant's unlawful race discrimination practices was a determinative factor in his termination.
 - 51. These actions as aforesaid constitute violations of Section 1981.

Count III <u>Violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII")</u> ([1] Racial Discrimination & [2] Retaliation)

- 52. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 53. Plaintiff also observed that Ms. Chesney exhibited a hostile and antagonistic demeanor towards Plaintiff that she did not exhibit towards the non-black employees within her group under Mr. Hearn's direct supervision.

- 54. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff was terminated from Defendant because of her race and/or because she complained of racial discrimination to Defendant's management, including but not limited to Mr. Hearns and Father Greg.
- 55. Plaintiff believes and avers herein that his race and/or his complaints about Defendant's unlawful race discrimination practices was a determinative factor in his termination.
 - 56. These actions as aforesaid constitute violations of Title VII.

Count IV <u>Violation of the Pennsylvania Wage Payment Collection Law ("WPCL")</u> (43 P.S. 260.3(a)-(b))

- 57. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 58. Upon Plaintiff's termination, Defendant failed to compensate Plaintiff for vacation/personal days she had accrued (but did not use) during her employment with Defendant.
- 59. During Plaintiff's employment, Defendant agreed to pay and/or provide vacation/personal days to Plaintiff. Plaintiff did not utilize these vacation/personal days during her employment with Defendant and to date, Plaintiff has not been paid for said vacation/personal days.
- 60. These actions as aforesaid constitute violations of the Pennsylvania Wage Payment and Collection Law.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court enter an Order providing that:

A. Defendant is to be prohibited from continuing to maintain its illegal policy, practice or custom of discriminating/retaliating against employees and is to be ordered to promulgate an effective policy against such unlawful acts and to adhere thereto;

- B. Defendant is to compensate Plaintiff, reimburse Plaintiff and make Plaintiff whole for any and all pay and benefits Plaintiff would have received had it not been for Defendant's illegal actions, including but not limited to past lost earnings, future lost earnings, salary, pay increases, bonuses, medical and other benefits, training, promotions, pension, and seniority. Plaintiff should be accorded those benefits illegally withheld from the date he first suffered retaliation/discrimination at the hands of Defendant until the date of verdict;
- C. Plaintiff is to be awarded liquidated damages, as permitted by applicable law(s) asserted herein, in an amount believed by the Court or trier of fact to be appropriate to punish Defendant for its willful, deliberate, malicious and outrageous conduct and to deter Defendant or other employers from engaging in such misconduct in the future;
- D. Plaintiff is to be accorded any and all other equitable and legal relief as the Court deems just, proper and appropriate including for emotional distress (upon amendment of Plaintiff's complaint to include his claim under the Philadelphia Fair Practices Ordinance);
- E. Plaintiff is to be awarded the costs and expenses of this action and reasonable legal fees as provided by applicable federal and state law;
- F. Any verdict in favor of Plaintiff is to be molded by the Court to maximize the financial recovery available to Plaintiff in light of the caps on certain damages set forth in applicable federal law; and
- G. Plaintiff's claims are to receive a trial by jury to the extent allowed by applicable law. Plaintiff has also endorsed this demand on the caption of this Complaint in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b).

Respectfully submitted,

KARPF, KARPF, & CERUTTI, P.C.

By: Ari R. Karpf, Esquire

3331 Street Road

Two Greenwood Square, Suite 128 Bensalem, PA 19020

(215) 639-0801

Dated: April 25, 2018

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

	Christine	Green	CIVIL ACTION	
•	, v .	•	,	
Congrega Germanto	ation of the Mission of St. Violent's Sem	incent De Paul in	NO.	
	In accordance with the plaintiff shall complete filing the complaint and side of this form.) In designation, that defend the plaintiff and all othe to which that defendant	Civil Justice Expense and a Case Management Track serve a copy on all defendathe event that a defendant ant shall, with its first appear parties, a Case Managem believes the case should be	1	ime of everse g said rve on
•	SELECT ONE OF TH	E FOLLOWING CASE N	IANAGEMENT TRACKS:	
	(a) Habeas Corpus - Ca	ses brought under 28 U.S.	C. § 2241 through § 2255.	()
-	(b) Social Security - Ca and Human Services	uses requesting review of a sidenying plaintiff Social S	decision of the Secretary of Health ecurity Benefits.	, ()
	(c) Arbitration - Cases	required to be designated f	or arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2,	()
	(d) Asbestos – Cases in exposure to asbestos	volving claims for persona	l injury or property damage from	()
	commonly referred:	to as complex and that nee rse side of this form for a c	nto tracks (a) through (d) that are if special or intense management by letailed explanation of special	()
•	•	•		
	(f) Standard Manageme	ent – Cases that do not fall	into any one of the other tracks.	(X)
	4/25/2018		Plaintiff	
	Date	Attorney-at-law		
	(215) 639-0801	(215) 639-4970	akarpf@karpf-law.com	
	Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address	

(Clv. 660) 10/02

la caracterista de la companya del companya de la companya del companya de la companya del la companya de la co

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

WENT AND THE PARTY OF THE PARTY	to be used by someon to instead of the automorph of the automorph
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM assignment to appropriate calendar.	to be used by counsel to inmeate the estegory of the case for the purpose of
Address of Pininiff. 7915 Pickering Street, Philadelphia, PA 19150	
Address of Defendant: 500 East Chelten Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 1	9144
Place of Accident Incident or Transpollon: Defendant's place of business	
(Use Reverse Side Po	
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation	on and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1	(a)) Yes 🗆 No 🗖
Does this case involve multidistrict lidgation possibilities?	Yes□ No.
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	Tinta Tarasinated
Case Number: Judge	Pare restitutioned
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	•
1. Is this case related to properly included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within on	e year previously terminated action in this court?
and the second s	Yes No No No No within one was writingly terroinsted
 Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a pri- action in this court? 	or start heritains are written one year proviously tenaminated
•	Yes□ No□
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earli	or numbered case pending or within one year previously
terminated action in this court?	Yes□ No□
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil r	ights case filed by the same individual?
4. 19 this case a second of successive names could be security appears or processing	Yes□ No□
CIVIL: (Place V in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)	
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. D Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
2. G FELA	2. D Airplane Personal Injury
3. Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. D Assault, Defamation
4. D Antitrust	4. D Marine Personal Injury
5. © Patent	5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
6. D Labor-Management Relations	6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify)
7. N Civil Rights	7. Products Liability
***	8. Products Liability — Asbestos
8. D Habeas Corpus	9. All other Diversity Cases
9. D Securities Act(s) Cases	(Please specify)
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Fluese abouty)
11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify)	
ARBITRATION CE	
Check Appropriate Counsel of record do hereby counsel of r	ertify:
M Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge a	and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action care exceed the sum of
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	
CI Rollef other than monotary damages is sought.	
DATE: 4/25/2018	ARK2484 Attorney I.D.# 91538
Attomog-ut-Law	Attorney I.D.# 91538
NOTE: A trial do novo will be a trial by jury only it	there has been compliance with R.R.C.P. 38.
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not religied to any case now pending	or within one year previously terminated action in this court
except as noted above.	
4/25/2018	ARK2484
DATE:Attomoy-at-Law	Atterney 1.D.# 91538
CIV. 609 (5/2012)	7 300

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The IS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as

provided by local rules of court purpose of initiating the civil d	t. This form, approved by the ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCT	e Judicial Conference of TONS ON NEXT PAGE OF	f the Unite F THIS FOI	d States in Septemb (M.)	oer 1974	, is requir	ed for the use of the	he Clerk of Cour	t for the		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS GREEN, CHRISTINE				DEFENDANTS CONGREGATION OF THE MISSION OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUI IN GERMANTOWN, D/B/A ST. VINCENT'S SEMINARY							
											• •
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.							
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name,	Address, and Telephone Number)			Attorneys (If Kno	10чп)						
Karpf, Karpf & Cerutti, Suite 128, Bensalem, PA											
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in Or	ee Box Only)		TIZENSHIP O		INCIPA	AL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in and One Box fo			
1 U.S. Government	X 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			PTF							
Plaintiff			Citizen of This State			1	of Business In		•	4	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi	o of Parties in Item III)	Citize	n of Another State	2	2	Incorporated and Pr of Business In		5	5	
				n or Subject of a reign Country	3	3	Foreign Nation	•	6	6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	Γ (Place an "X" in One Box Onl		== ==FC	RUGUURWEENAE	TY I		k here for: <u>Nature</u>	of Suit Code De			
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting X 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer, w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer, w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage 385 Property Damage 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 550 Civil Detainee - Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of	0 699 2714 0 721 0 74 751 0 79	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 10 Other Dear LABOR Dear Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Management Relations Relations Railway Labor Act Family and Medical Leave Act 10 Other Labor Litigation Employee Retirement Income Security Act 2 Naturalization Applic 5 Other Immigration Actions	881 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	423 With 28 L PROPE 820 Copy 830 Pater 835 Pater New 840 Trad SOCIAI 861 HIA (862 Blac 863 DIWC 864 SSI(865 RSI (4	REYRIGHTS wrights int int - Abbreviated brug Application emark SECURITY 1395ff) k Lung (923) CDIWW (405(g)) D Title XVI	0 480 Consum 0 490 Cable/S 0 850 Securitie Exchan 0 890 Other St 0 891 Agricult 0 893 Environ 0 895 Freedon Act 0 896 Arbitrat 0 899 Adminis	(31 USC)) apportion t t nd Bankin ce tion er Influenc Organizati er Credit at TV ss/Common ss/Common ss/Common tration to f Inform ion trative Pro iew or Ap Decision trionality of	g detect and cons dities/ ctions etters nation occurre occurr	
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" is XI Original Proceeding States	moved from 3	Confinement Remanded from Appellate Court	0 4 Rein Reor	ened A	ransferr Another I		0 6 Multidist Litigation Transfer	n -	Multidi Litigati Direct F	on -	
 	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	tute under which you ar	e filing (D	o not cite iurisdictiona	4	s unless div		· ·			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Rrief description of car	ADEA (29USC621); 42USC1981; T Brief description of cause: Violations of the ADEA, 42USC1981, Title V		IRA, the Phila Fair Practices Ordinance and the PA Wage Payment Co							
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	O CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2:	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	N D	EMAND \$			CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND		complai	nt:	
VIII. RELATED CASS	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE				_DOCKI	ET NUMBER				
DATE 4/25/2018		SIGNATURE OF AT	ORNEYO	FRECORD		·		·		· · ·	

JUDGE

APPLYING IFP

Save As... Print

AMOUNT

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT#

Reset

MAG, JUDGE